

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6-8, 14, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Number 6,201,690 to Moore et al. (hereinafter Moore) in view of United States Patent Number 5,388,032 to Gill et al. (hereinafter Gill), United States Patent Number 5,549,374 to Krivec (hereinafter Krivec), and United States Patent Number 6,266,236 to Ku et al. (hereinafter Ku).

Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 1, 6-8, 14, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore in view of Gill, Krivec, and Ku. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 1, 8, and 14 to include the limitations of “...two longitudinal frames horizontally separated by two lateral frames, the longitudinal frames and lateral frames forming a **horizontally disposed open rectangle with a first lateral frame connecting only to a proximal end of each longitudinal frame, a second lateral frame connecting only to a distal end of each longitudinal frame...**” Claim 1. See also claims 8 and 14.

The Examiner argues that the frame 43 of Moore forms a horizontally disposed open rectangle when seen from the front. Office action of March 9, 2007, page 2, ¶ 2; Moore, fig. 9, ref. 43. Applicants respectfully disagree. The open rectangle of the frame 43 in Moore is vertically disposed. Therefore, Moore does not teach all of the limitations of claims 1, 8, and 14.

In addition, each of the lateral frames of Moore as identified by the Examiner is connected to both the proximal end and the distal end of the longitudinal frame of Moore. In

contrast, the present invention claims "...a first lateral frame connecting only to a proximal end of each longitudinal frame, a second lateral frame connecting only to a distal end of each longitudinal frame..." Therefore Moore does not disclose **a first lateral frame connecting only to a proximal end of each longitudinal frame, a second lateral frame connecting only to a distal end of each longitudinal frame.** Because Moore, Gill, Krivec, and Ku do not teach all of the limitations of the present invention, Applicants submit that claims 1, 8, and 14 are allowable. Applicants further submit that claims 6, 7, and 22 are allowable as depending from allowable claims.

As a result of the presented remarks, Applicants assert that claims 1, 6-8, 14, and 22 are in condition for prompt allowance. Should additional information be required regarding the traversal of the rejections of the claims enumerated above, Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicants of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian C. Kunzler/

Brian C. Kunzler
Reg. No. 38,527
Attorney for Applicant

Date: May 9, 2007
8 East Broadway, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
Telephone (801) 994-4646
Fax (801) 531-1929